

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
*ex rel.* MARY SCOTT,

Plaintiff,

v.

METROPOLITAN HEALTH  
CORPORATION d/b/a METROPOLITAN  
HOSPITAL, a Michigan corporation, and  
MICHAEL FAAS, an individual, jointly  
and severally,

Defendants.

---

Case No. 1:02-CV-485

Hon. Richard Alan Enslen

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Mary Scott has moved for reconsideration of the Court's Order of February 23, 2006, which denied her post-judgment Motion for Recusal. Defendants Metropolitan Health Corporation and Michael Faas have opposed the Motion. Oral argument is unnecessary in that the briefing shows that the relief sought should be promptly denied.

Pursuant to Western District of Michigan Local Civil Rule 7.4(a), reconsideration is appropriate only when the movant "demonstrate[s] a palpable defect by which the Court and the parties have been misled . . . [and] that a different disposition must result from the correction thereof." Plaintiff's Motion shows neither. Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate any bias, prejudice or financial interest warranting recusal or even any appearance of impropriety warranting recusal. The case law cited by Plaintiff is simply inapposite and refers to distinct factual scenarios. Attenuated relationships and unsubstantiated conspiracy theories of the kind referenced by Plaintiff cannot form a legitimate basis for recusal motions because it would replace our system of random

judicial assignment with wholesale judge shopping. The latter would hardly be an improvement particularly in the context of post-judgment motions framed to replace a judge experienced with a long and factually complex suit. For these reasons and those argued by Defendants in their Response;

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff Mary Scott's Motion for Reconsideration (Dkt. No. 678) is **DENIED**.

DATED in Kalamazoo, MI:  
March 24, 2006

/s/ Richard Alan Enslen  
RICHARD ALAN ENSLEN  
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE